

Serial No.: 10/807,983

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 07 2006

and creates a digest of the detail screen based on control information created by control information creating means. Moreover, digest screen display content changing means changes the display content of the digest screen in response to an operation of a user.

The cited art to Orr, US Patent 5895476, filed: September 9, 1996, is entitled: "Design engine for automatic reformatting for design and me". The abstract of Orr reads:

"A three-way separation of information in a document includes content, design and media aspects. This division supports automatic rendering to multiple forms of media such as print, Intranet, Internet, and OLE embedding. A method changes the design of a composition having a current design that is rendered in a particular medium. The composition is represented by components in a current design tree and includes content elements associated with the components. A new design tree is created for the composition based upon a new design and new design components. Next, each of the content elements are linked into an association with one of the new design components such that the set of relationships between the content elements in the context of the new design are maintained. Media layout values are calculated for each content element of the composition. The content elements are laid out in the new design and the new design retains the composition rendered in the particular medium. Another method changes the medium of a composition having a current design. A new media tree is created for the composition that is representative of a new medium and includes media tree components. Next, each of the content elements is associated with one of the media tree components such that each of the content elements is associated with a region of the new medium. Media layout values are calculated for each content element of the composition such that each of the media layout values for each content element defines one of the regions of the new medium."

Thus, Orr is concerned with "automatic rendering to multiple forms of media such as print, Intranet, Internet, and OLE embedding." Orr is not concerned with and does not allude to, "[D]igest screen display content deciding means" to select "display elements belonging to respective regions of a document based on display priorities of the display elements," as in claims

DOCKET NUMBER: JP2003-0045TIS1

9/16

Serial No.: 10/807,983

1-19. Orr is directed to "A three-way separation of information in a document includes content, design and media aspects." "This division supports automatic rendering to multiple forms of media such as print, Intranet, Internet, and OLE embedding." This has little or no relationship to and doesn't make obvious the invention novelties of claims 1-20. A review of the cited portions of Orr reveals that besides using some words and/or phrases that may be common with words and/or phrases of Claims 1-20, this entire and/or cited portions of Orr do not allude to and are not useful for backup or justification for making the invention in Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12 obvious. Thus claims 1-20 are allowable over the cited art.

Regarding claims 1, 6, 8 and 12, Orr suggests means for selecting the display elements based ... exceed a required display area. For example, Orr discloses a design for automatic reformatting for design and media, which fits content to media, where new content is added to the composition, content is readjusted in order to make the information fit within the desired media (col. 39, lines 35-67) based on a priority from the priority list (col. 35, lines 21-25). Orr does not expressly teach means for setting a merging relationship among regions ... included in the document, but with Orr's teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. For example, Orr discloses components being placed in a location that overlaps within the region occupied by the parent component, yet in a different orientation (col. 30, line 60 - col. 31, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret Orr to include placing components in a location that overlaps within the region occupied by the parent, yet in a different orientations as equivalent as taught by Orr to a merging relationship, providing the benefit of having the user author a document once and then having a system to adapt the document automatically for changes in the design or output media while maintaining the relationships between content elements of the document (col. 2, lines 43-47).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the so called equivalency of Orr and the elements in claims 1, 6, 8 and 12. For example, claim 1 reads:

1. An information processing apparatus comprising means for creating a digest of a document a layout of which is determined, the document including a plurality of regions, each region including one or more display elements, the means for creating comprising:
 - means for selecting the display elements based on display priorities of the display elements, and for deciding all of selected display elements as a display content of a digest

Serial No.: 10/807,983

screen under a condition where a total display area of all of the selected display elements does not exceed a required display area; and

means for setting a merging relationship among the regions by deciding a merging region, with which a region not being displayed on the digest screen is merged, from among regions displayed on the digest screen based on layout information for the regions in the document, all of the regions being included in the document.

The 'means for selecting' and the 'means for setting a merging relationship' as are the other elements of Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12 are "for creating a digest of a document a layout of which is determined, the document including a plurality of regions, each region including one or more display elements." Any alleged so called equivalencies with the 'means for selecting' or 'setting' etc., in Orr, are for a method that "changes the design of a composition having a current design that is rendered in a particular medium." For example, the cited portion of Orr (col. 39, lines 35-67) reads.

FIG. 33 now describes the fit content to media step 520 of FIG. 29. At this point in FIG. 29, new content has been added to the composition. But because most media is limited in some sense (i.e., paper media may be limited to a certain number of pages), it may be necessary to either readjust the content, the design or the media of the composition in order to make the information fit within the media. The information may be adjusted to fit within the desired media in a wide variety of manners. By way of example, the design may be readjusted to allow the content to fit within the available media. Alternatively, the media may be adjusted, i.e. the media may be lengthened, in order to allow the content to fit within the media. That is, the number of pages in a document may be changed, or the calculation of the media divisions may dictate a different layout. Also, the content itself may be adjusted in some fashion to fit within a defined media region. For example, a filler image may be clipped from a larger stock image in order to make everything fit within a page. It should be appreciated that any one these techniques may be used by itself, or in conjunction with the other techniques. Step 520 describes a method for fitting the information of a composition into a media region by adjusting the content and design.

Once new content has been added to a composition, there may be a variety of reasons why

Serial No.: 10/807,983

the overall content of the composition must be adjusted in order to fit it within the available media. For example, if a page of text is nearly full and a picture is dropped onto this page, the design tree will be changed because a new component is created for the picture. In this situation, not only are the design tree and the content tree changed, but also the media tree will have new regions calculated for the newly dropped picture. In another"

Besides using some words and/or phrases that may be common with to Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12, this entire portion of Orr does not allude to and is not useful for making the invention in Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12 obvious. The office communications statement below actually shows the opposite to 'obviousness' or the lack of equivalency with Orr and claim 1. Actually, there is no inventive commonality between Orr and claims 1-20. Thus exception is taken with the office communication statement:

For example, Orr discloses a design for automatic reformatting for design and media, which fits content to media, where new content is added to the composition, content is readjusted in order to make the information fit within the desired media (col. 39, lines 35-67) based on a priority from the priority list (col. 35, lines 21-25). Orr does not expressly teach means for setting a merging relationship among regions ... included in the document, but with Orr's teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. For example, Orr discloses components being placed in a location that overlaps within the region occupied by the parent component, yet in a different orientation (col. 30, line 60 - col. 31, line 5).

The placement of overlap is not related to the regions in claims 1-20. Applicant takes particular exception with the statement in the office communication:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret Orr to include placing components in a location that overlaps within the region occupied by the parent, yet in a different orientations as equivalent as taught by Orr to a merging relationship, providing the benefit of having the user author a document once and then having a system to adapt the document automatically for changes in the design or output media while maintaining the relationships between content elements of the document (col. 2, lines 43-47).

Review of this portion reveals that Orr is not related to the present claimed invention. Orr's "design for automatic reformatting for design and media, which fits content to media, where new content is added to the composition, content is readjusted in order to make the information fit within the desired media (col. 39, lines 35-67) based on a priority from the priority list," does not do the functions of the means for selecting and/or 'setting' of Claims 1-20. The alleged

DOCKET NUMBER: JP2003-0045TIS1

12/16

Serial No.: 10/807,983

obviousness statement is relying Orr which is not related to the elements in Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12. Indeed it would not be obvious to use Orr as a backdrop to make Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12 obvious. Furthermore, applicant takes exception with and requests backup for statement of the alleged obviousness. Thus Claims 1, 6, 8 and 12 are not made obvious by the augmentation with Orr, and are allowable.

Regarding claims 2, 9 and 13, Orr suggests means for deciding ... displayed regions is required. For example, when a child component is being placed at a distance from the region occupied by the parent components, a decision has to be made such as left- hand side or a right-hand side of the region to display the component (col. 30, line 60 - col. 31, line 4).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the so called equivalency of Orr and the elements in claims 2, 9 and 13. For example, claim 2 reads:

2. (Original) The information processing apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising means for deciding, as a display content of a detail screen, a region group including the regions displayed on the digest screen and the region merged with the displayed regions in response to that a detail display of the displayed regions is required.

Review of this portion reveals that Orr is not related to the present claimed invention. Orr's "when a child component is being placed at a distance from the region occupied by the parent components, a decision has to be made such as left- hand side or a right-hand side of the region to display the component (col. 30, line 60 - col. 31, line 4)," bears no relationship to the elements in claims 2, 9 and 13. Orr (col. 30, line 60 - col. 31, line 4), reads:

FIG. 25d is an example of a child component 414 being placed in a location that overlaps with the region occupied by the parent component 416. FIG. 25e is an example of a child component 418 placed within the region occupied by the parent component 420 yet in a different orientation to that of the parent. FIG. 25f is an example of a child component 422 being placed at a distance from the region occupied by the parent component 424. A child component may also coincide completely with the region occupied by the parent component, or may occupy any portion of the region of the parent component, such as a left-hand side or a right-hand side"

This has little or no relationship to "means for deciding, as a display content of a detail screen, a region group including the regions displayed on the digest screen and the region merged with the displayed regions in response to that a detail display of the displayed regions is required," as in

DOCKET NUMBER: JP2003-004511S1

13/16

Serial No.: 10/807,983

claim 2. Orr does not do the functions of the means for selecting and/or 'setting' and/or 'deciding' etc., of Claims 1-20. The alleged obviousness statement is relying Orr which is not related to the elements in claims 2, 9 and 13. Indeed it would not be obvious to use Orr as a basis to make claims 2, 9 and 13 obvious. Thus claims 2, 9 and 13 are allowable each for itself and because each depends on an allowable claim.

Regarding 3, 10 and 14, Orr suggests means for creating control ... required display area. For example, most media is limited and adjustment may be needed to make the media fit "within" the media (col. 39, lines 35-45). The concept of "within" suggest that more content of media exists that there is space allocated for it, which is equivalent to the claim language "too large to fit in the required display area".

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the so called equivalency of Orr and the elements in claims 3, 10 and 14. For example, claim 3 reads:

3. (Original) The information processing apparatus according to claim 2, further comprising means for creating control information for controlling a display of the detail screen, wherein the means for deciding the display content of the detail screen creates a digest of the detail screen based on the control information when the region group is too large to fit in the required display area.

The so called suggestion by Orr of 'means for creating' is in fact apparently not so. Orr (col. 39, lines 35-45) reads:

FIG. 33 now describes the fit content to media step 520 of FIG. 29. At this point in FIG. 29, new content has been added to the composition. But because most media is limited in some sense (i.e., paper media may be limited to a certain number of pages), it may be necessary to either readjust the content, the design or the media of the composition in order to make the information fit within the media. The information may be adjusted to fit within the desired media in a wide variety of manners. By way of example, the design may be readjusted to allow the content to fit within the available media.

This has no relation to "means for creating control information for controlling a display of the detail screen, wherein the means for deciding the display content of the detail screen creates a digest of the detail screen based on the control information when the region group is too large to fit in the required display area," in claim 3. Thus claims 3, 10 and 14 are allowable over Orr.

Serial No.: 10/807,983

Regarding claims 4, 11 and 15. Orr teaches means for deciding the display operation of a user. For example, a user authors a document, thereafter the document reformatting is automatic, upon initiation by the author (col. 2, lines 43-47).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the so called equivalency of Orr and the elements in claims 4, 11 and 15. A review of the cited portion of Orr has little or no relationship to the claimed invention. Thus claims 4, 11 and 15 are allowable over Orr.

Regarding claim 5. Orr suggests changing means ... operation of a user. For example, a user authors a document, thereafter the document reformatting is automatic, upon initiation by the author (col. 2, lines 43-47).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the so called equivalency of Orr and the elements in claim 5. A review of the cited portion of Orr has little or no relationship to the claimed invention. Thus claim 5 is allowable over Orr.

Regarding claim 7, Orr suggests means for arraying ... predetermined criterion; means for obtaining a ratio ... length of the region; and means for dividing ... of the display elements. Based on the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim, the Examiner interprets the concept of the claim as equivalent to performing calculations on the displayed elements and whitespace, in order to provide an interface that is optimally fit for the display region while maintaining referential integrity. Although Orr does not use the express language of the claim such as "arrayed display elements", Orr does suggest the conceptual quest of the claim language when viewed with the broadest reasonable interpretation under the specification. For example, based on the fixed properties, the image will adjust itself in order to fit in a particular region and will keep its aspect ratio and will automatically adjust its height in order to fit the region taking in consideration a user specification (col. 43, lines 4-14). Additionally, Orr does expressly disclose content scale factors for scaling content either up or down in order to assist in fitting all of the content into the available media, including a white space scale factor (col. 40, lines 26-48).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that exception is taken with the so called equivalency of Orr and the elements in claim 7. A review of the cited portion of Orr has little or no relationship to the claimed invention. Thus claim 7 is allowable over Orr.

DOCKET NUMBER: JP2003-0045751

15/16